

EVALUATION REVIEW COMMITTEE
OF THE TEACHING AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS ADVISORY BOARD
Kansas State Department of Education
KSDE Board Room

Official Minutes for January 23, 2009

Present: Mike Neal, Kathy Dale, Connie Ferree, Rick Henry, David Hofmeister, Judy Johnson, Sherry Kinderknecht, Shirley Meissner, Scott Myers,

Absent: Linda Alexander, Greg Rasmussen, Sue Smith, Martin Straub

KSDE Staff: Jeanne Duncan, Jan Williams

Called meeting to order—Chair, Mike Neal

Mike Neal, chair, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

Approval of Agenda for January 23, 2009

Motion: It was M/S (Hofmeister/Myers) to approve the agenda.

Motion carried; 9 in favor and 0 opposed

Approval of November 21, 2008 Minutes

Motion: It was M/S (Johnson/Meissner) to approve the minutes.

Motion carried; 9 in favor and 0 opposed

Announcements

Jan Williams researched the Robert's Rules of Order and distributed to the committee the item that addressed changing a vote and the procedures to follow.

Meeting of Review Teams

Mike Neal asked that Shirley Meissner move to the second review team to even the numbers because of absentee members. Shirley agreed to join the team chaired by Rick Henry.

Meeting of Review Teams:

The review teams met at 8:38 a.m.

Assignments:

Friends University New Program (no rejoinder)
Kansas Wesleyan University Upgrade Reports
Fort Hays State University Progress Reports

Team:

Mike Neal, Chair
Sherry Kinderknecht
Connie Ferree
Scott Myers
David Hofmeister

Assignments:

University of Kansas Upgrade Reports
McPherson College Upgrade Reports

Team:

Rick Henry, Chair
Judy Johnson
Shirley Meissner
Kathy Dale

Recommendations for Friends University—New Program Review

Physical Education (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Kinderknecht/Ferree) to recommend the status of “**New Program Approved with Stipulation**” through December 31, 2015:

Motion carried; 7 in favor and 0 opposed and 2 abstentions (Meissner, Hofmeister)

New programs must be operational within two years after approval.

Recommendations for Kansas Wesleyan University—Upgrade Reports

Physical Education (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Myers/Hofmeister) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2014.

Motion carried; 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Health (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-4

None

Motion: It was M/S (Myers/Hofmeister) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2014.

Motion carried; 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Biology (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-2, 6-7, 9-18

None

Standard 3

AFI 3.1 There is a lack of a rubric aligned to the standard.

Rationale: No rubric has been provided to describe the criteria for proficiency. Therefore, it is not clear how points are earned. It is unclear how the assessment determines the candidate’s proficiency to meet the standard.

Standard 4

AFI 4.1 There is a lack of a rubric aligned to the standard.

Rationale: : It is not clear how points are earned. The proficiency levels are listed, but it is not clear what determines, what discriminate the different levels. The assessment describes what the grade is, but not how it is earned.

Standard 5

AFI 5.1 There is a lack of a rubric aligned to the standard.

Rationale: No rubric has been provided to describe the criteria for proficiency. Therefore, it is not clear how points are earned. It is unclear how the assessment determines the candidate’s proficiency to meet the standard.

Standard 8

AFI 8.1 There is a lack of a rubric aligned to the standard.

Rationale: It is not clear how points are earned. The proficiency levels are listed, but it is not clear what determine what discriminate the different levels. The assessment describes what the grade is, but not how it is earned.

Motion: It was M/S (Myers/Hofmeister) to retain the areas for improvement and recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2014.

Motion carried; 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Recommendations for Fort Hays State University—Progress Reports

Early Childhood Unified (I, Birth-Grade 3)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-13

None

Motion: It was M/S (Hofmeister/Kinderknecht) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Dale)

History Comprehensive (I, 5-8)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-6

None

Standard 7

AFI 7.1 Proficiency levels are not well defined.

Rationale: The assessment as designed allows a candidate to fail all geography items on the assessment and still meet proficiency level.

Standard 8

AFI 8.1 Proficiency levels are not well defined.

Rationale: The assessment as designed allows a candidate to fail all social system items and still meet proficiency level.

Motion: It was M/S (Hofmeister/Kinderknecht) to remove the areas for improvement and recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Dale)

NOTE: Attachment #1, line 3, word “science” should be mathematics.

Mathematics (I, 5-8)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1 and 2

AFI 1. Inconsistency in explanation of how data provides evidence for meeting standard. Section IV Assessment #6 (Standards 1 & 2) indicates a competency level of 90% required on competency exams, but Standards Interpretation report indicates that scores (below 90%) were in the acceptable range.

Rationale: Inconsistency between sections IV and V.

AFI 2. No required competency levels are indicated for rubrics used in scoring the three mini-lessons.
(Standards 1-2)

Rationale: Section IV lacks evidence for how meeting standard will be determined. Data source is unclear (as reported in Section V). Standards 1 & 2 are assessed by Assessment #6 (Section IV) which includes both exams and student developed mini-lessons. It is unclear which (or combination?) of these data sources are reported in Section V.

Standards 3-9

AFI 3. No required competency levels are indicated for rubrics/exams (Section IV) although Section V indicates data in the acceptable range. (Standards 3-9)

Rationale: Section IV lacks evidence for how meeting standard will be determined. Although data in Section V indicates Standard 9 is not being met, that section does address needed actions for continuous improvement for the new program.

Motion: It was M/S (Hofmeister/Kinderknecht) to remove the areas for improvement and recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Dale)

NOTE: Attachment #2, eighth bullet, word “math” should be science.

Science (I, 5-8)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-14

None

Motion: It was M/S (Hofmeister/Kinderknecht) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Dale)

Recommendations for The University of Kansas—Upgrade Reports

Building Leadership (A, PreK – 12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Dale/Johnson) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2013.

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Neal)

District Leadership (A, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Dale/Johnson) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2013.

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Neal)

Elementary (I, K-6)
Areas for Improvement:
Standard 1-7
None

Motion: It was M/S (Dale/Meissner) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2013.

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Neal)

Mathematics (I, 5-8)
Areas for Improvement:
Standards 1-9
None

Motion: It was M/S (Dale/Meissner) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2013.

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Neal)

Mathematics (I, 6-12)
Areas for Improvement:
Standard 1-8
None

Motion: It was M/S (Dale/Meissner) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2013.

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Neal)

Recommendations for McPherson College—Upgrade Reports

ESOL (I, K-6, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-10

None

Motion: It was M/S (Meissner/Dale) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2014.

Motion carried; 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Health (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-4

None

Motion: It was M/S (Dale/Henry) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2014.

Motion carried; 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Physical Education (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1 -7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Johnson/Henry) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2014.

Motion carried; 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Committee Deliberations and Actions

Deliberations and actions began at 9:56 a.m.

Discussion

Mike discussed the aspect of change in the forthcoming months in regard to accreditation and programs. He indicated that this committee has a great responsibility in reviewing accreditation, programs and making recommendations to the State Board. Jeanne thanked all current members for attending.

Adjourn

It was decided by consensus to adjourn at 10:45 a.m.